

THE NEW JACKALS: RAMZI YOUSEF, OSAMA BIN LADEN AND THE FUTURE OF TERRORISM
A PORTRAYAL OF THE LIFE AND CRIMES OF RAMZI YOUSEF AHMED, THE TERRORIST WHO BOMBED THE NEW YORK WORLD TRADE CENTER IN 1998

(By Simon Reeve)

On 26 February 1993 a massive bomb devastated New York's World Trade Center, creating more hospital casualties than any event in American history since the Civil War. Ramzi Yousef, the young British-educated terrorist who masterminded the attack, had been seeking to topple the twin towers and cause tens of thousands of fatalities.

An intensive FBI investigation into the crime quickly developed into a man-hunt that took top FBI agents across the globe. But even with the FBI on his trail, Yousef continued with his campaign of terror. He bombed an aeroplane and an Iranian shrine.

He tried to kill Benazir Bhutto, the former Pakistani Prime Minister, and planned to assassinate the Pope, President Clinton and simultaneously destroy 11 airliners over the Pacific Ocean using tiny undetectable bombs. He also plotted an attack on the CIA headquarters with a plan loaded with chemical weapons. His pursuers dubbed Yousef "an evil genius".

During their huge investigation FBI agents discovered that Yousef was funded and sent on some of his attacks by Osama bin Laden, a mysterious Saudi millionaire. By the mid-1990's they realized bin Laden had become the most influential sponsor of terrorism in the world, and agents now conclude that since the early 1990s a small group of terrorists supported by bin Laden have dominated international terrorism.

These "Afghan Arabs" helped defeat the Soviets in Afghanistan before killing thousands of people in campaigns against governments in the West, Africa, the Middle East and Asia. When bin Laden's followers attacked American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania on 7 August 1998, killing 224 people, the U.S. finally launched cruise missile strikes in an attempt to destroy his secret organization.

Drawing on unpublished reports, interrogation files, interviews with senior FBI agents who hunted Yousef, intelligence sources and government figures including Benazir Bhutto, Simon Reeve gives a harrowing account of Yousef's bombings, offers a revealing insight into his background, and details the FBI's man-hunt to catch him.

Reeve explains how Yousef was one of bin Laden's first operatives and documents bin Laden's life and emergence as the leader of a potent terrorist organisation, giving fascinating insights into the man President Clinton has called "the pre-eminent organizer and financier of international terrorism in the world today".

Highly detailed and yet immensely readable, *The New Jackals* sheds new light on two of the world's most notorious terrorists. Reeve warns that Yousef and bin Laden are just the first of a new breed of terrorist, men with no restrictions on mass killing. He also offers evidence that bin Laden's organization may already have chemical and nuclear weapons and explains why the world could soon face attacks by terrorists with weapons of mass destruction.

Simon Reeve is a journalist and writer. He worked for *The Sunday Times* for five years before leaving to finish co-writing *The Millennium Bomb*, published in 1996. He has since contributed to books on corruption, organized crime and terrorism, and has written

investigative feature articles for publications ranging from *Time* magazine to *Esquire*. He lives in London.

During research for *The New Jackals* Reeve has eaten ice cream sorbet with Benazir Bhutto, spent hours sitting in a stairwell on a London housing estate waiting for a former Lebanese smuggler, met American intelligence officials in a suburban burger bar and a Chinese restaurant, and been followed by agents from two different countries during meetings with a renegade spy.

Ramzi Yousef, Osama bin Laden and the "Afghan Arabs" have "dominated international terrorism as it relates to the United States and Europe [in the 1990s]. At the international level the only terrorist apparatus that the United States has had to deal with over the past several years has been Osama bin Laden and before that Ramzi Yousef." Oliver "Buck" Revell, former Deputy Director of the FBI.

"Ramzi Yousef is an evil genius." Senior Pakistani intelligence officer.

"Yousef was a pretty unique person. He liked the bar scene, he liked women, he liked moving around. Yousef was very good. He was well trained, very clever. He'll certainly be ranked right up there with the all-timers. Even to this day, he is a very shadowy figure that we really don't know that much about, even after all that's been done and all that's been investigated on him." Neil Herman, the FBI Supervisory Special Agent who led the New York Joint Terrorist Task Force during the hunt for Yousef.

"Yes, I am a terrorist, and I'm proud of it." Ramzi Yousef.

"In the past, we were fighting terrorists with an organisational structure and some attainable goal like land or the release of political prisoners. But Ramzi Yousef is the new breed, who are more difficult and hazardous. They want nothing less than the overthrow of the West, and since that's not going to happen, they just want to punish—the more casualties the better." Oliver "Buck" Revell, former Deputy Director of the FBI.

"He's a cold-blooded terrorist. He doesn't care who he kills. He may be the most dangerous man in the world." Superintendent Samuel Pagdilaog of the Philippines National Defense Police describing Yousef.

"One man said to me 'remember there will only be those who believe and those who will die. There will only be the dead and the believers'." Benazir Bhutto, former Prime Minister of Pakistan.

"If Russia can be destroyed, the United States can also be beheaded." Osama bin Laden.

"In my personal view [Osama bin Laden] is very much interested in obtaining weapons of mass destruction and he has the money to pay for them. It's certainly a credible threat." Peter Probst, Pentagon terrorism expert.

"We don't consider it a crime if we tried to have nuclear, chemical, biological weapons. If I have indeed acquired these weapons, then I thank God for enabling me to do so." Osama bin Laden.

"Terrorism is changing. We expect biological attacks in the future." Marvin Cetron, author of the Pentagon's secret *Terror 2000* investigation.

—
"THE NEW JACKALS" BY SIMON REEVE

AL QAEDA

Perhaps most crucially, bin Laden cannily invested in Gum Arabic Company Limited, a Khartoum-based firm which has a virtual

monopoly over most of Sudan's exports of gum Arabic, which in turn comprises around 80 per cent of the world's supply. Gum Arabic comes from the sap of the Sudanese acacia tree. A colourless, tasteless gum, it makes newspaper ink stick to printing presses, keeps ingredients in drinks from settling at the bottom of a can, and forms a film around sweets and medical pills, keeping them fresh. It is a crucial ingredient in dozens of products Western consumers use every day, and within two years in arriving in Sudan, bin Laden is believed to have secured an effective monopoly over the entire Sudanese output.

Even now the State Department in Washington and analysts at the CIA remain unsure whether bin Laden is still profiting from his investment. Thirty per cent of the shares in Gum Arabic Company Limited are held by the Sudanese government, who may or may not be siphoning profits into bin Laden accounts. The other 70 per cent is held by individual shareholders and banks, any or all of whom may be acting as fronts for bin Laden. It is still possible that every time someone buys an American soft drink they are helping to fill Osama bin Laden's coffers.

August 11, 2000.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: Thank you for your recent letter expressing your concern about Section 1439 of H.R. 4868. The humanitarian situation in Sudan is a tragic one, and every effort should be made to bring an end to the unnecessary suffering of the Sudanese people.

The Administration agrees with you that the sanctions on the government of Sudan's exportation of gum arabic should not be lifted. The government of Sudan has not made progress in rectifying the human rights abuses for which those sanctions were imposed, and we should not consider permanently lifting sanctions until satisfactory progress has been made.

The crisis in the Sudan is an important issue to me. I recently shared my concerns with Secretary General Annan, and requested that he and his staff continue to work to ensure that humanitarian organizations like Operation Lifeline Sudan are able to effectively carry out their desperately-needed work.

I share your hope for and commitment to an end to this humanitarian disaster.

Sincerely,

RICHARD C. HOLBROOKE.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF GALVESTON HURRICANE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a concurrent resolution in memory of the 100th anniversary of the devastating hurricane which struck Galveston, Texas, on September 8, 1900. The residents of Galveston showed great courage and sacrifice during that terrible storm, and I thought it was important for Congress to recognize that that same spirit is still present in the people who live there today; and I wanted to join them as they honor the memories of those who lost their lives on that historic day 100 years ago.

In an era without radar, satellites or modern radio, the island of Galveston was quickly overtaken by vast waves, surging flood waters and powerful winds of more than 120 miles per hour. The hurricane that struck Galveston is the deadliest natural disaster in the history of the United States of America. It is estimated that more than 6,000 people lost their lives in a matter of a few hours. Prior to the storm, Galveston was a thriving port community of 37,000 people and was dubbed the Wall Street of the West.

Stories from the survivors of the storm are filled with displays of courage and self-sacrifice in the face of grave danger. One of the most famous is the one about the nuns who ran the orphanage. As the winds and storm tides got higher, it became obvious that the last building would collapse. The nuns tied the children to themselves with clothesline, eight or nine kids to each nun, in a sad, brave effort to try to save them. Three little boys survived the night by camping in a tree. All the rest died.

Galveston never lost that resilient spirit and went on to build a 17-foot seawall that staved off other fierce hurricanes. The city also pumped in millions of tons of sand from the Gulf of Mexico in order to raise the level of the city and its buildings to a safer height.

This weekend, Galveston will be holding a ceremony commemorating the hurricane, honoring the memories of those who died, launching education efforts, and celebrating the rebirth of Galveston after the storm. My resolution extends those efforts to our Nation's Capital and to all the people of the United States. We should honor those who died in the storm and use the anniversary to continue improving hurricane forecasting and to make life safer and more secure along our coasts.

My resolution recognizes the historical significance of the 100th anniversary of the hurricane, it remembers the victims, and it urges the President to issue a proclamation in memory of the thousands of Galvestonians who lost their lives and the survivors who rebuilt the city.

□ 1745

FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank those making this period of time available today to further the discussion of the bill that was vetoed and then sustained earlier today.

I would gather that anyone listening to the debate today was rather con-

fused about what was in the bills or what was not in the bills or what the effect would be. But to do this, to set the stage for this, I think it is important for us to go back and to review the budget debates earlier this year.

And I want to speak on behalf again of the Blue Dog budget, the Blue Dog Coalition, that proposed a budget that got 171 votes, a majority of the Democrats, and 33 Republicans, joined with us when we were debating. And we thought this year's budget debates should be built around a framework that would put our government on a path of retiring and entirely eliminating our public debt by 2010. We thought it was important to save 100 percent of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses. And we thought it important to allow a net tax cut, net tax cut of \$387 billion over 10 years targeted to small businesses and middle-income families and make investments in priority programs of \$387 billion over the same 10-year period.

That became known as the 50/25/25 plan, taking any non-Social Security surpluses and taking 50 percent of that to pay down the debt. Because I have found in my district at home, and I notice the polls bear this out, that the American people by and large, by 70 percent plus, want to see the Congress fix Social Security for the future, because every one knows that beginning in 2010 we are going to have some difficult times delivering on our promises of Social Security particularly at the exact same time that the baby boomers will be retiring. No one disputes that.

We felt like that that was important, but the majority party felt like the most important thing that they could do this year was to deliver a 1.3, 1.6, pick the number, \$1 trillion tax cut of which every one agrees that many of those components are very, very, very popular.

But the Blue Dogs have said first off when we hear people talk about the \$4.6 trillion surplus, we know, and I hope the majority of the American people will soon know, those are projected surpluses.

My colleague will hear in a moment from the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), in which he will show there are no surpluses, and he will be right, 100 percent right.

When we disregard the trust funds, not only the Social Security, but Medicare and military and civil service retirement and now railroad retirement, there are no surpluses, but yet we keep hearing this. And then we hear the rhetoric that says \$4.6 trillion, it is your money, and we are going to return a part of it to you.

This kind of prompted me to say that even young school children know to complete the phrase I swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. As common as that phrase is, we sometimes forget that. In the

courthouse, it is rather important. I would wish that it was also important here in the U.S. House, because just this afternoon, as we have heard many times, the truth is, yes, the marriage tax penalty is unfair and in many cases two married individuals currently are taxed at a higher rate than they would be had they remained single, and that is not fair.

It is true that family farms and ranchers and other small businesses sometimes have a difficult time paying the current death tax, that is true.

But then let us talk about the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Yes, the \$4.6 trillion that we hear so much about, most of us understand and I hope the American people will soon understand, those are projected surpluses, not a single American family tonight will go out and spend projected income without a risk.

If we get an extra bonus of \$5,000 and we owe our bank \$10,000, we do not go out and spend it on a vacation, unless we are willing to take a chance on digging our family into a deeper hole. Why should our country be different?

That was the argument that many of us were making this afternoon as pertained to the so-called death tax. I personally feel very strongly that the bill the President vetoed should have been vetoed. In fact, I personally recommended that he do veto the bill, and here is why.

When we look at the effect of a bill that is phased in, in 2010, 10 short years from today, that creates a hole in our budget of \$50 billion that will expand over the next 10 years to \$750 billion, without a plan of how we are going to be dealing with that or just passing on to future Congresses, really, we are passing it on to our grandchildren.

It seemed to me that the first bill that ought to have come to the floor of the House should have been a Social Security reform bill. That should have been the first bill, followed quickly by the Medicare and Medicaid reform bill.

Back home I have numerous hospitals that, unless we put together a balanced budget fix again this year, we will have to close their doors, and this is no exaggeration. Now, to those that talk about spending, if we do not wish to spend some additional money to keep rural hospitals and inner-city hospitals open, that is a fair position for anyone to take, and we will have that discussion. But that is the one we ought to have first, how do we provide for the minimal needs?

As we heard the gentlewoman from Michigan talking about the pharmaceutical bill needs, all that is well established, but yet today we had a bill, the first one to be vetoed. And now I hope the message is sunk in to the leadership of the House, that the next bill also will be vetoed and will be sustained, because I suspect now that most people are beginning to see that